



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/675,386	09/30/2003	Jeyhan Karaoguz	14824US02	6836
23446 7590 02/25/2009 MCANDREWS HELD & MALLOY, LTD 500 WEST MADISON STREET SUITE 3400 CHICAGO, IL 60661				
EXAMINER TRUONG, THANHNGA B				
ART UNIT 2435		PAPER NUMBER		
MAIL DATE 02/25/2009		DELIVERY MODE PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.

10/675,386

Applicant(s)

KARAOGUZ ET AL.

Examiner

THANHNGA B. TRUONG

Art Unit

2435

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 10 February 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: None.

Claim(s) objected to: None.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-31.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: None.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____
13. ☐ Other: _____.

/Thanhnga B. Truong/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2435

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant has argued that:

The combination of Haines, Cudak and Kirkoshi does not describe, teach or suggest "associating at least one identifier with said legacy media peripheral, wherein said at least one identifier is used to validate said legacy media peripheral for use at said first geographic location.

Examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant and still maintains that:

The combination of teaching between Haines, Cudak and Kirkoshi does teach the claimed subject matter that has been addressed in previous action and repeated herein again. The new proposed amendment does not change the meaning or merely change the scope of the limitations. Haines teaches associating at least one identifier with said legacy media peripheral (page 1, paragraph 0009 of Haines), wherein said at least one identifier is used to validate said legacy media peripheral for use at said first geographic location (page 5, paragraph 0085-0086 of Haines), wherein paragraph 0009 has shown the computer readable code is configured to cause a processor to determine that a status change has occurred in the peripheral device, combine a unique device identifier relevant to the peripheral device with the status change to form an electronic message and transmit the electronic message from an embedded web server contained in the peripheral device across a firewall; and wherein paragraphs 0085 and 0086 have disclosed the embedded web server 26 of FIG. 1 then combines a device identifier with the detected consumable or maintenance threshold status in a step S62. In one embodiment, the device identifier comprises a serial number of the peripheral device. In this embodiment, the vendor has previously associated this serial number with other data, such as the identity and physical address of the owner or user of the peripheral device. In one embodiment, the device identifier comprises an account number that was assigned to the peripheral device during the process P2. In one embodiment, the account number was stored in the embedded web server 26 of the peripheral device 14. In one embodiment, a group of similar devices having a common user or owner, or maintainer, may share an account number, in which the serial number with other data, such as the identity and physical address of the owner is the at least one identifier is used to validate the peripheral.

Although Haines teaches a method for secure access and communication of information in a distributed media network, Haines is silent on the capability of showing the legacy media peripheral. On the other hand, Cudak teaches this limitation in column 13, line 14 of Cudak. The combination of teaching between Haines and Cudak teaches the claimed subject matter, however, they are silent on the capability of showing the geographic location where the peripheral device is being used. On the other hand, Kirkoshi et al teaches this limitation in Figure 4 and column 6, lines 55-67 of Kirkoshi.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, based on the above explanation, the combination of teaching between Haines, Cudak and Kirkoshi is efficient and proper.

Haines, Cudak and Kirkoshi do not need to disclose anything over and above the invention as claimed in order to render it unpatentable or anticipate. A recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claimed limitations.

The fact that Examiner may not have specifically responded to any particular arguments made by Applicant and Applicant's Representative, should not be construed as indicating Examiner's agreement therewith.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained..